MS Word Exhibit 300 for O&M (BY2008) (Form) / KSC Shuttle Processing Support (Item)

Form Report, printed by: System Administrator, **Jan 31, 2007**

OVERVIEW

General Information	
1. Date of Submission:	Jan 26, 2007
2. Agency:	026
3. Bureau:	00
4. Name of this Capital Asset:	KSC Shuttle Processing Support
Investment Portfolio:	BY OMB 300 Items
5. Unique ID:	026-00-01-03-01-1425-00
(For IT investments only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.)	

All investments
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2008?
(Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M ONLY in FY2008, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2008 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.)
Operations and Maintenance
7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?
FY2001 or earlier
8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap.
Kennedy Space Center relies on converted Apollo infrastructure, facilities and equipment for Space Shuttle Processing. This investment enables the KSC infrastructure to operate properly. The Shuttle Processing Support (SPS) investment reduces life cycle cost of critical ground systems. The requirements for replacement of obsolete GSE allows support funding if the lifecycle cost of the replacement GSE is less than the projected lifecycle costs for existing GSE. The SPS project supports business needs of the Space Shuttle Program (SSP) by mitigating risks of critical facilities and equipment with a current replacement value in excess of $3 Billion. Risk is mitigated by expending capital where necessary to fly the SSP safely. If not funded the SSP Process assumes additional risk against the APA , a likely 4-8 month manifest impact, and increased probability of launch delays/scrubs. As an example of the equipment impacted by this program, the existing Hydrogen Umbilical Mass Spectrometer (HUMS) Computer Command and Control system is over 10 years old and some of the VME cards are obsolete and no longer supported. The Launch Site Equipment (LSE) budget helps maintain this aged infrastructure. The SSP Integration Information Technology (IT) plan is a part of the Space Flight Operations Contract (SFOC) overall annual Level A (5 year) and Level B (annual Fiscal Year) IT Plan deliverables to the SSP Chief Information Officer (CIO). Plans were reviewed and approved by the SSP CIO with concurrence from the Johnson Space Center CIO, KSC CIO and Marshall Space Flight Center CIO. Major IT expenses deal with sustaining the above systems or migrating mainframe projects to web-based, client-server environment using state of the art technology for data access, availability and transfer. The functions supported by this investment have existed since the mid 1970s. Business management processes and supporting financial management processes have evolved to accommodate the evolving program needs and reporting requirements. While NASA can report life-cycle costs for this program and its major projects, it is difficult to trace the entire life-cycle costs history associated with this IT investment. Life-cycle costs reported cover FY 2003 through the planned termination of the program. This investment is closely coupled with Shuttle processing. The loss of this investment would require reverting to manual based systems. This would increase headcount and impact processing.
9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?
Yes
9.a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval?
Apr 7, 2006

10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?

Yes

12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project.

Yes

12.a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)?

Yes

12.b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)

No

12.b.1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?

12.b.2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?

12.b.3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?

13. Does this investment support one of the PMA initiatives?

Yes

If "yes," select the initiatives that apply:

Human Capital	Yes
Budget Performance Integration	Yes
Financial Performance	Yes
Expanded E-Government	Yes
Competitive Sourcing	Yes
Faith Based and Community	
Real Property Asset Management	
Eliminating Improper Payments	
Privatization of Military Housing	
R and D Investment Criteria	
Housing and Urban Development Management and Performance	
Broadening Health Insurance Coverage through State Initiatives	
Right Sized Overseas Presence	
Coordination of VA and DoD Programs and Systems	

13.a. Briefly describe how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)?

NASA full cost budgeting & accounting process improves financial management, while linking budget and performance using the NASA Integrated Budget & Performance Document. The Shuttle support contract & follow-on are competitively sourced. This investment supports strategic human capital management & allocation as part of the continued effort to keep the Shuttle flying safely. It advances agency efforts to leverage new IT technologies & create electronic access for program performance.

14. Does this investment support a program assessed using OMB's Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)?

Yes

14.a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during the PART review?

Yes

14.b. If "yes," what is the name of the PART program assessed by OMB's Program Assessment Rating Tool?

Space Shuttle

14.c. If "yes," what PART rating did it receive?

Adequate

15. Is this investment for information technology (See section 53 for definition)?

Yes

For information technology investments only:

16. What is the level of the IT Project (per CIO Council's PM Guidance)?

Level 2

17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council's PM Guidance)

(1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment

18. Is this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2006 agency high risk report (per OMB's 'high risk" memo)?

No

19. Is this a financial management system?

No

19.a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area?

19.a.1. If "yes," which compliance area:

19.a.2. If "no," what does it address?

This investment enables the Kennedy Space Center (KSC) to continue to use a significant portion of converted Apollo infrastructure, facilities, and equipment for Shuttle Processing. SPS is primarily comprised of the Launch Site Equipment budget that helps maintain this aged infrastructure, facilities, and equipment with a current replacement value (CRV) in excess of $3B.

19.b. If "yes," please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A–11 section 52.

20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2008 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

Area	Percentage	
Hardware	38.00	
Software	12.00	
Services	50.00	
Other		
Total	100.00	

21. If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities?

N/A

22. Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions

Name	

Phone Number	
Title	
Email	

23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval?

Yes

SUMMARY OF FUNDING

SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (In Millions)

1. Provide the total estimated life-cycle cost for this investment by completing the following table. All amounts represent budget authority in millions, and are rounded to three decimal places. Federal personnel costs should be included only in the row designated "Government FTE Cost," and should be excluded from the amounts shown for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." The total estimated annual cost of the investment is the sum of costs for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." For Federal buildings and facilities, life-cycle costs should include long term energy, environmental, decommissioning, and/or restoration costs. The costs associated with the entire life-cycle of the investment should be included in this report.

All amounts represent Budget Authority

(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)

	PY 2006	CY 2007	BY 2008
Planning:	0.000	0.000	0.000
Acquisition:	0.000	0.000	0.000
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	0.000	0.000	0.000
Operations & Maintenance:	30.994	19.635	12.636
TOTAL	30.994	19.635	12.636
Government FTE Costs	0.111	0.956	0.861
# of FTEs	1.0	8.0	7.0
Total, BR + FTE Cost	31.105	20.591	13.497

Note: For the cross-agency investments, this table should include all funding (both managing partner and partner agencies).

Government FTE Costs should not be included as part of the TOTAL represented.

2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's?

No

2.a. If "yes," how many and in what year?

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2007 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes.

No changes

*Budget Comments * Internal Use Only**

Shuttle Processing Support enables the Kennedy Space Center (KSC) to continue to use a significant portion of converted Apollo infrastructure, facilities, and equipment for Shuttle Processing. Shuttle Processing Support is mostly comprised of the Launch Site Equipment (LSE) budget that helps maintain this aged infrastructure, facilities, and equipment with a current replacement value (CRV) in excess of $3B. Priorities for this funding are assessed and reprioritized on a continuing, almost daily basis. As a result of this reprioritization process, funding levels for IT projects will wax and wane when competing in the same budget pool with heavy equipment procurements like Crawler Transporter refurbishment. Project budgets are funded with a "just in time" goal of replacing equipment prior to irreparable failure.
The IT components of this budget are primarily driven by the fact that the definition of "IT Projects" includes projects that are replacing archaic ground systems with modernized systems that may happen to have IT components within the new system architecture. The purpose of this budget is not to fund IT projects, but to fund equipment replacement in response to equipment obsolescence in order to keep the doors open at KSC for the Shuttle Program to process and launch safely. Since this line is managed with the sole purpose of mitigating risk to the Shuttle Program, the return on investment business case may not necessarily meet the criteria of offering cost avoidance, until that investment is compared with the cost of standing the program down until a system is repaired or replaced.
As projects are continually reassessed for funding prioritization the IT budget component within this line will vary significantly.

PERFORMANCE

Performance Information

In order to successfully address this area of the exhibit 300, performance goals must be provided for the agency and be linked to the annual performance plan. The investment must discuss the agency's mission and strategic goals, and performance measures must be provided. These goals need to map to the gap in the agency's strategic goals and objectives this investment is designed to fill. They are the internal and external performance benefits this investment is expected to deliver to the agency (e.g., improve efficiency by 60 percent, increase citizen participation by 300 percent a year to achieve an overall citizen participation rate of 75 percent by FY 2xxx, etc.). The goals must be clearly measurable investment outcomes, and if applicable, investment outputs. They do not include the completion date of the module, milestones, or investment, or general goals, such as, significant, better, improved that do not have a quantitative or qualitative measure.

Agencies must use Table 1 below for reporting performance goals and measures for all non-IT investments and for existing IT investments that were initiated prior to FY 2005. The table can be extended to include measures for years beyond FY 2006.

Table 1

	Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/baseline (from Previous Year)	Planned Performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)
1	2003	Goal 8: Ensure the provision of space access, and improve it by increasing safety, reliability, and affordability	Maintain 100% availability of GSE by continuing to study performance results to ensure quality improvements	100% of Ground Support Equipment are flight Ready and provide improved performance	Initiate the pilot phases and studies to determine quality of improvements	100%
2	2004	Goal 8: Ensure the provision of space access, and improve it by increasing safety, reliability, and affordability	Maintain 100% availability of GSE by continuing to study performance results to ensure quality improvements	100% of Ground Support Equipment are flight Ready and provide improved performance	Percent availability of GSE	100%
3	2003	Goal 8: Ensure the provision of space access, and improve it by increasing safety, reliability, and affordability	Maintain 99% or better availability	Availability of systems: Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 99% Expectation = 97% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >97%	Monthly percentage of unplanned or unscheduled outage supports the agency's goal of maintaining high LPS system reliability and helps ensures space access	99.2%
4	2004	Goal 8: Ensure the provision of space access, and improve it by increasing safety, reliability, and affordability	Maintain 99% or better availability	Availability of systems: Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 99% Expectation = 97% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >97%	Monthly percentage of unplanned or unscheduled outage supports the agency's goal of maintaining high LPS system reliability and helps ensures space access	99.3%
5	2003	Goal 8: Ensure the provision of space access, and improve it by increasing safety, reliability, and affordability	Maintain SOE of 95% on-time delivery	On-time Delivery of LPS IT Products - Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 95% Expectation = 80% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >80%	Annual percentage On-Time Delivery of LPS IT products support both the Programs overall reliability and ensure affordability of the systems	93.4%
6	2004	Goal 8: Ensure the provision of space access, and improve it by increasing safety, reliability, and affordability	Maintain SOE of 95% on-time delivery	On-time Delivery of LPS IT Products - Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 95% Expectation = 80% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >80%	Annual percentage On-Time Delivery of LPS IT products support both the Programs overall reliability and ensure affordability of the systems	91.94

7	2003	Goal 8: Ensure the provision of space access, and improve it by increasing safety, reliability, and affordability	Maintain SOE of 4 or less discrepancies (DRs) against LPS released applications	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across released LPS applications Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 4 or less Discrepancy Reports (DRs) Expectation = 5 to 7 DRs Maximum Error Rate (MER) = 8 DRs	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across released LPS applications supports both the Programs overall reliability and ensures affordability of the systems	3.55 DRs per month
8	2004	Goal 8: Ensure the provision of space access, and improve it by increasing safety, reliability, and affordability	Maintain SOE of 4 or less discrepancies (DRs) against LPS released applications	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across released LPS applications Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 4 or less Discrepancy Reports (DRs) Expectation = 5 to 7 DRs Maximum Error Rate (MER) = 8 DRs	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across released LPS applications supports both the Programs overall reliability and ensures affordability of the systems	5.14 DRs per month

All new IT investments initiated for FY 2005 and beyond must use Table 2 and are required to use the FEA Performance Reference Model (PRM). Please use Table 2 and the PRM to identify the performance information pertaining to this major IT investment. Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding "Measurement Area" and "Measurement Grouping" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for at least four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov.

Table 2

	Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvements to the Baseline	Actual Results
1	2005	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Monthly percentage of unplanned or unscheduled outage supports the agency's goal of maintaining high LPS system reliability and helps ensures space access	Availability of systems: Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 99% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >97%	Maintain 99% or better availability each year from 2005 to 2010	99.9 % Availability
2	2006	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Monthly percentage of unplanned or unscheduled outage supports the agency's goal of maintaining high LPS system reliability and helps ensures space access	Availability of systems: Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 99% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >97%	Maintain 99% or better availability each year from 2005 to 2010	TBD
3	2007	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Monthly percentage of unplanned or unscheduled outage supports the agency's goal of maintaining high LPS system reliability and helps ensures space access	Availability of systems: Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 99% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >97%	Maintain 99% or better availability each year from 2005 to 2010	TBD
4	2005	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	Annual percentage On-Time Delivery of LPS IT products support both the Programs overall reliability and ensure affordability of the systems	On-time Delivery of LPS IT Products - Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 95% Expectation = 80% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >80%	Re-establish SOE of 95% on-time delivery each year from 2005 to 2010	96.2%
5	2006	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	Annual percentage On-Time Delivery of LPS IT products support both the Programs overall reliability and ensure affordability of the systems	On-time Delivery of LPS IT Products - Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 95% Expectation = 80% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >80%	Re-establish SOE of 95% on-time delivery each year from 2005 to 2010	TBD

6	2007	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	Annual percentage On-Time Delivery of LPS IT products support both the Programs overall reliability and ensure affordability of the systems	On-time Delivery of LPS IT Products - Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 95% Expectation = 80% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >80%	Re-establish SOE of 95% on-time delivery each year from 2005 to 2010	TBD
7	2005	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across released LPS applications supports both the Programs overall reliability and ensures affordability of the systems	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across released LPS applications Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 4 or less Discrepancy Reports (DRs) Expectation = 5 to 7 DRs Maximum Error Rate (MER) = 8 DRs	Maintain SOE of 4 or less discrepancies (DRs) against LPS released applications each year from 2005 to 2010	4.9 IPRs per month
8	2006	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across released LPS applications supports both the Programs overall reliability and ensures affordability of the systems	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across released LPS applications Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 4 or less Discrepancy Reports (DRs) Expectation = 5 to 7 DRs Maximum Error Rate (MER) = 8 DRs	Maintain SOE of 4 or less discrepancies (DRs) against LPS released applications each year from 2005 to 2010	TBD
9	2007	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across released LPS applications supports both the Programs overall reliability and ensures affordability of the systems	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across released LPS applications Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 4 or less Discrepancy Reports (DRs) Expectation = 5 to 7 DRs Maximum Error Rate (MER) = 8 DRs	Maintain SOE of 4 or less discrepancies (DRs) against LPS released applications each year from 2005 to 2010	TBD
10	2005	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Space Operations	Achieve 100% on-orbit mission success for all Shuttle missions. Mission success criteria are those provided to the prime contractor (SFOC) for purposes of determining successful accomplishment of the performance fees in the contract	100%	100%	100%
11	2006	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Space Operations	Achieve 100% on-orbit mission success for all Shuttle missions. Mission success criteria are those provided to the prime contractor (SFOC) for purposes of determining successful accomplishment of the performance fees in the contract	100%	100%	TBD
12	2007	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Space Operations	Achieve 100% on-orbit mission success for all Shuttle missions. Mission success criteria are those provided to the prime contractor (SFOC) for purposes of determining successful accomplishment of the performance fees in the contract	100%	100%	TBD

13	2008	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Space Operations	Achieve 100% on-orbit mission success for all Shuttle missions. Mission success criteria are those provided to the prime contractor (SFOC) for purposes of determining successful accomplishment of the performance fees in the contract	100%	100%	TBD
14	2009	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Space Operations	Achieve 100% on-orbit mission success for all Shuttle missions. Mission success criteria are those provided to the prime contractor (SFOC) for purposes of determining successful accomplishment of the performance fees in the contract	100%	100%	TBD
15	2010	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Space Operations	Achieve 100% on-orbit mission success for all Shuttle missions. Mission success criteria are those provided to the prime contractor (SFOC) for purposes of determining successful accomplishment of the performance fees in the contract	100%	100%	TBD
16								
17	2008	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Monthly percentage of unplanned or unscheduled outage supports the agency's goal of maintaining high LPS system reliability and helps ensures space access	Availability of systems: Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 99% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >97%	Maintain 99% or better availability each year from 2005 to 2010	TBD
18	2009	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Monthly percentage of unplanned or unscheduled outage supports the agency's goal of maintaining high LPS system reliability and helps ensures space access	Availability of systems: Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 99% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >97%	Maintain 99% or better availability each year from 2005 to 2010	TBD
19	2010	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Monthly percentage of unplanned or unscheduled outage supports the agency's goal of maintaining high LPS system reliability and helps ensures space access	Availability of systems: Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 99% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >97%	Maintain 99% or better availability each year from 2005 to 2010	TBD
20								
21	2008	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	Annual percentage On-Time Delivery of LPS IT products support both the Programs overall reliability and ensure affordability of the systems	On-time Delivery of LPS IT Products - Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 95% Expectation = 80% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >80%	Re-establish SOE of 95% on-time delivery each year from 2005 to 2010	TBD
22	2009	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	Annual percentage On-Time Delivery of LPS IT products support both the Programs overall reliability and ensure affordability of the systems	On-time Delivery of LPS IT Products - Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 95% Expectation = 80% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >80%	Re-establish SOE of 95% on-time delivery each year from 2005 to 2010	TBD

23	2010	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	Annual percentage On-Time Delivery of LPS IT products support both the Programs overall reliability and ensure affordability of the systems	On-time Delivery of LPS IT Products - Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 95% Expectation = 80% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >80%	Re-establish SOE of 95% on-time delivery each year from 2005 to 2010	TBD
24	2008	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across released LPS applications supports both the Programs overall reliability and ensures affordability of the systems	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across released LPS applications Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 4 or less Discrepancy Reports (DRs) Expectation = 5 to 7 DRs Maximum Error Rate (MER) = 8 DRs	Maintain SOE of 4 or less discrepancies (DRs) against LPS released applications each year from 2005 to 2010	TBD
25	2009	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across released LPS applications supports both the Programs overall reliability and ensures affordability of the systems	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across released LPS applications Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 4 or less Discrepancy Reports (DRs) Expectation = 5 to 7 DRs Maximum Error Rate (MER) = 8 DRs	Maintain SOE of 4 or less discrepancies (DRs) against LPS released applications each year from 2005 to 2010	TBD
26	2010	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across released LPS applications supports both the Programs overall reliability and ensures affordability of the systems	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across released LPS applications Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 4 or less Discrepancy Reports (DRs) Expectation = 5 to 7 DRs Maximum Error Rate (MER) = 8 DRs	Maintain SOE of 4 or less discrepancies (DRs) against LPS released applications each year from 2005 to 2010	TBD

EA

Enterprise Architecture (EA)

In order to successfully address this area of the business case and capital asset plan you must ensure the investment is included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process, and is mapped to and supports the FEA. You must also ensure the business case demonstrates the relationship between the investment and the business, performance, data, services, application, and technology layers of the agency's EA.

1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture?

Yes

1.a. If "no," please explain why?

2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy?

Yes

2.a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.

KSC Shuttle Processing Support

2.b. If "no," please explain why?

Service Reference Model

3. Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/egov/.

Component: Use existing SRM Components or identify as "NEW". A "NEW" component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM.

Reused Name and UPI: A reused component is one being funded by another investment, but being used by this investment. Rather than answer yes or no, identify the reused service component funded by the other investment and identify the other investment using the Unique Project Identifier (UPI) code from the OMB Ex 300 or Ex 53 submission.

Internal or External Reuse?: 'Internal' reuse is within an agency. For example, one agency within a department is reusing a service component provided by another agency within the same department. 'External' reuse is one agency within a department reusing a service component provided by another agency in another department. A good example of this is an E-Gov initiative service being reused by multiple organizations across the federal government.

Funding Percentage: Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the funding level transferred to another agency to pay for the service.

	Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	Service Domain	Service Type	Component	Reused Component Name	Reused UPI	Internal or External Reuse?	Funding %
1	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports Process Tracking by maintaining the infrastructure including servers, storage and network services	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking			No Reuse	2.00

2	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports Case / Issue Management by maintaining the infrastructure including servers, storage and network services	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Case Management			No Reuse	3.00
3	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports Risk Management by maintaining the infrastructure including servers, storage and network services	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Risk Management			No Reuse	3.00
4	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports Inbound Correspondence Management by providing the communications tools necessary for budget formulation, planning, resource loading, and execution through an application software interface	Process Automation Services	Routing and Scheduling	Inbound Correspondence Management			No Reuse	2.00
5	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports Outbound Correspondence Management by providing the communications tools necessary for project planning, resource loading, and execution through an application software interface that notifies team members of their action items to be performed and schedule publication	Process Automation Services	Routing and Scheduling	Outbound Correspondence Management			No Reuse	2.50
6	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports Project Management through interfaces with Microsoft Project Professional, contractor 533 data, and IFMP	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Program / Project Management			No Reuse	4.00
7	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports Workgroup/Groupware by maintaining the infrastructure including servers, storage and network services	Business Management Services	Organizational Management	Workgroup / Groupware			No Reuse	8.00
8	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports Network Management by maintaining the infrastructure including servers, routers, switches and firewalls	Business Management Services	Organizational Management	Network Management			No Reuse	5.00
9	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports Performance Management by providing the tools necessary for budget formulation, planning, execution, and reporting through an application software interface	Business Management Services	Investment Management	Strategic Planning and Mgmt			No Reuse	2.00
10	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports Performance Management by providing the tools necessary for budget formulation, planning, execution, and reporting through an application software interface	Business Management Services	Investment Management	Performance Management			No Reuse	2.00
11	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports Library / Storage by maintaining the infrastructure including servers, storage and network services for 20TB of Ground Support data	Digital Asset Services	Document Management	Library / Storage			No Reuse	5.00
12	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports Document Review and Approval by providing an integrated system for the review and approval of project operating plans	Digital Asset Services	Document Management	Document Review and Approval			No Reuse	2.00
13	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports Modeling by providing for upgrades to the video simulation interface and budget modeling	Business Analytical Services	Knowledge Discovery	Modeling			No Reuse	7.00
14	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports Mathematical services by providing the software tools and data formatted for trend analysis	Business Analytical Services	Analysis and Statistics	Mathematical			No Reuse	7.00

15	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports Structural/Thermal services by providing the resources necessary for NDE analysis	Business Analytical Services	Analysis and Statistics	Structural / Thermal			No Reuse	3.00
16	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports Radiological services by providing the resources necessary for NDE analysis	Business Analytical Services	Analysis and Statistics	Radiological			No Reuse	3.00
17	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports Graphing/Charting services by providing the software tools and data formatted for trend analysis and reporting	Business Analytical Services	Visualization	Graphing / Charting			No Reuse	5.00
18	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports Imagery by providing resources for the KSC Image Analysis facility	Business Analytical Services	Visualization	Imagery			No Reuse	5.00
19	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports Multimedia by providing resources for the KSC Image Analysis facility	Business Analytical Services	Visualization	Multimedia			No Reuse	4.00
20	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports CAD by providing resources for systems design and engineering. Tools utilized include Visio, Microstation, and AutoCad	Business Analytical Services	Visualization	CAD			No Reuse	7.00
21	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports Demand Forecasting / Management by providing the tools necessary for project managers to resource load Civil Service team members by name in an integrated environment that looks at that team members commitments with other projects to avoid double booking limited resources	Business Analytical Services	Business Intelligence	Demand Forecasting / Mgmt			No Reuse	4.00
22	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports Balanced Scorecard by providing resources and tools for business process assesment and scoring	Business Analytical Services	Business Intelligence	Balanced Scorecard			No Reuse	4.00
23	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports Decision Support and Planning by providing the tools necessary for project managers to create a schedule in an integrated environment that allows for resource loading of Civil Service team members by name and looks at that team members commitments with other projects to avoid double booking limited resources. It also provides for tools that facilitate budget prioritization over the 6 year budget window	Business Analytical Services	Business Intelligence	Decision Support and Planning			No Reuse	2.00
24	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports Information Retrieval by providing the tools necessary for effective retrieval of program knowledge data	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Information Retrieval			No Reuse	3.00
25	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports Information Mapping by providing the tools necessary for knowledge information extraction from raw program data	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Information Mapping / Taxonomy			No Reuse	2.00
26	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports Knowledge Capture by providing the tools necessary for knowledge data preservation from raw program data sources	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Knowledge Capture			No Reuse	2.00

27	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports Knowledge Distribution by providing the tools necessary for knowledge information routing to key program decision makers	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Knowledge Distribution and Delivery			No Reuse	3.00
28	Space & Ground Network IT Support	SPS supports Knowledge Engineering by providing the tools necessary for design, development and testing of STS program knowledge information management systems	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Knowledge Engineering			No Reuse	2.00

Technical Reference Model

4. To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.

FEA SRM Component: Service Components identified in the previous question should be entered in this column. Please enter multiple rows for FEA SRM Components supported by multiple TRM Service Specifications.

Service Specification: In the Service Specification field, Agencies should provide information on the specified technical standard or vendor product mapped to the FEA TRM Service Standard, including model or version numbers, as appropriate.

SRM Component	Service Area	Service Category	Service Standard
Computers / Automation Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser
Computers / Automation Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Wireless / PDA
Task Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications
Data Warehouse	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels
Computers / Automation Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet
Computers / Automation Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Peer to Peer (P2P)
Computers / Automation Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Virtual Private Network (VPN)
Data Warehouse	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting
Computers / Automation Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services
Computers / Automation Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management
Computers / Automation Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database

Computers / Automation Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage
Computers / Automation Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers
Computers / Automation Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices
Computers / Automation Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Peripherals
Computers / Automation Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Video Conferencing
Computers / Automation Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Local Area Network (LAN)
Computers / Automation Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards
Computers / Automation Management	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures
Computers / Automation Management	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services
Computers / Automation Management	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display
Computers / Automation Management	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display
Computers / Automation Management	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering
Computers / Automation Management	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Wireless / Mobile / Voice
Computers / Automation Management	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange
Computers / Automation Management	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware
Computers / Automation Management	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Enterprise Application Integration
Computers / Automation Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification
Computers / Automation Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation
Computers / Automation Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Transformation

Computers / Automation Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Discovery

5. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)?
No
5.a. If "yes," please describe.
6. Does this investment provide the public with access to a government automated information system?
No
6.a. If "yes," does customer access require specific software (e.g., a specific web browser version)?
6.a.1. If "yes," provide the specific product name(s) and version number(s) of the required software and the date when the public will be able to access this investment by any software (i.e. to ensure equitable and timely access of government information and services).

RISK

Risk Management

You should perform a risk assessment during the early planning and initial concept phase of the investment's life-cycle, develop a risk-adjusted life-cycle cost estimate and a plan to eliminate, mitigate or manage risk, and be actively managing risk throughout the investment's life-cycle.

Answer the following questions to describe how you are managing investment risks.

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?

Yes

1.a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan?

Sep 8, 2003

1.b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?

No

1.c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:

2. If there is currently no plan, will a plan be developed?

2.a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date?

2.b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?

3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule: (O&M investments do NOT need to answer.)

COST & SCHEDULE

Cost and Schedule Performance

1. Was operational analysis conducted?

Yes

1.a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed.

Jun 1, 2006

1.b. If "yes," what were the results?

Continuous operational assessments are performed on capital assets to determine their performance and effectiveness in meeting critical mission operations objectives. A Performance Measurement System is used to track and monitor monthly key metrics to evaluate the effectiveness, efficiency, productivity, availability, reliability, security, etc. of capital assets. Operations and maintenance costs associated with these capital assets are reviewed monthly in conjunction with the metrics to identify any early warning indicators that may impact lifecycle costs and performance goals. These data are used to reprioritize operations and maintenance costs to underperforming assets and/or the requests for new funding in annual Program Operating Plan inputs.

1.c. If "no," please explain why it was not conducted and if there are any plans to conduct operational analysis in the future.

Actual Performance against the Current Baseline

2. Complete the following table to compare actual cost performance against the planned cost performance baseline. Milestones reported may include specific individual scheduled preventative and predictable corrective maintenance activities, or may be the total of planned annual operation and maintenance efforts).

2.a. What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information?

Contractor and Government

	Description of Milestone	Planned End Date	Actual End Date	Planned Total Cost ($mil)	Actual Total Cost ($mil)	Schedule Variance (# of days)	Cost Variance ($mil)
1	FY 2006 Operational Support	Sep 30, 2006		30.994			
2	FY 2007 Operational Support	Sep 30, 2007		19.635			
3	FY 2008 Operational Support	Sep 30, 2008		12.636			

			DME	Steady State	Total
Completion date: Current Baseline:	Sep 30, 2011	**Total cost: Current Baseline:**		119.966	119.966
Estimated completion date:	Sep 30, 2010	**Estimate at completion:**			